34

G R S 59] GPB—15 000—22 7 14

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

~~191~~ 1899
(Eden)

File No. 9 of 99.

Serial Nos. 1 — 9

B
~~Papers Filed.~~

Month ~~nov 99~~

SUBJECT

Contention of Mr Cook regarding Privilege leave to Educational Officers

PREVIOUS REFERENCES	LATER REFERENCES
Countermanded T Fitzhardinge	Docket H Sothall

Note

Mr Cook contends that

~~Order~~ Art 173 of the N.S Regulations ~~of 1894 applies~~ to Col Officers on Roles do much as they are entitled to Privilege leave under Art 203

Navy are not

It is to be observed that Privilege leave is ordinarily not admissable to Officers enjoying regular vacations as in the case of Officers of other Depts

Under Art 203 privilege leave on half pay may however be granted to Col Officers under extraordinary Circumstances & on Certain Conditions "The rule "~~of~~ is only permissive, & does "not admit of any claim as a "matter of right"

+ vide Comptroller's letter No 11772 2 9 99

What is considered as privilege leave in Art 173 is privilege leave under the ordinary rules that can be availed of by such Officers as do not enjoy annual vacations The point is that

Casual

Canal leave (for more than 7 days) may be granted (to Ordinary Officers) + commutes into Privilege leave + deducted from the Priv leave that may be at, or may thereafter fall to, ~~at~~ their credit

As regards Canal leave a separate Art viz 174 applies to Educational Officers whereas the limit of canal leave that may be granted is 10 days

Arts 173 & 174 do not evidently apply in the case of Mr Krishnaswamy Iyer for reasons stated above, & for the fact that he has ~~exceeded~~ leave exceeds the limit of Canal leave that may be granted to him

While, Art 203 ~~does~~ is not applicable in as much as Mr Krishnaswamy Iyer is evidently not entitled to any privilege or leave.

Touching the ref^s quoted ~~pleader~~ by

Mr Cook, (3) the persons therein referred to have all been granted privilege leave on half pay (the leave being at their credit) under Art 203 hence these cannot be cited as precedents

A copy of the Comptrollers letter, referred to above may be forwarded to the Principal

Subd for Orders

nil
29.9.22

Subd. herewith

Under Art 203 of H. S' Regns (clause a) Privilege leave is not admissible to officers enjoying regular vacations but it may be granted to them under clause (b) in case

Will-drawal of my Minute

regulate accordingly,
and not otherwise.
This condition does not
apply to ordinary Furl
lough leave which can
be therefore be anticipated
under art. 173 This
article does not apply to
Ld. Officers for such
shorter provision is
made in art: 174 which
is made specially applic-
able to Officers enjoying
annual vacations"!

Draft submitted

[illegible]

Privilege leave to Officers
enjoying vacations (under article 203)
"Privilege leave at their
request or "Privilege
leave that may be granted

2) (5)

be caused - Neither article 172 nor article 173 therefore abolishes it then - It (i) leave granted only in case of urgent necessity - In the case of Principle leave by other officers it is caused by demise as a matter of course and no urgent necessity so a like qua non - The Learned Counsel does not therefore seem correct.

Ruled accordingly

12339

Q 29 Oct 1917

Oct 30/17

I quite agree with the ruling art 173 does not affect the other who enjoy annual vacations - article 174 therefore provides exclusively for such officers

The ruling of 173 "to officers not entitled" should be seen. means "to officers entitled other than those under Rules" here no such leave as others

[illegible] the Rules we should [illegible]

Note cont'd

The communication of the 1st Bombay's orders in this office No 5232-52 31-10 99 has occasioned the present letter from the Pl C College

In his letter No 573 29th July 1899, Mr Cook has stated that Mr Krishnaswami Iyer, was not entitled to any Privilege leave. It was only on account of that reason that he recommended that the leave (5th to 19th July 1899) granted to Krishnaswami Iyer might be treated as Privilege leave that he might thereafter earn, quoting wrongly art 173

Now it having been made out to him that the leave recommended is not of the nature of Casual leave — for it is 15 days which is in excess of the period admissible to Edl Officers art 174 — and that it cannot therefore be deducted under arts 172 & 173 from the Privilege leave whether at the credit or not as is the case of other officers, he thinks that the leave in question might be made admissible under art 203 But the Privilege leave grantable under the art is calculated under the ordinary rules (art 188) and can be given only if it is at the credit of the officer.

There is nothing in the Code to show that Privilege leave can be given when it is not due

Submitted for orders

TLBS
8-1-99

Subject to what I have said can make out there is nothing new urged in

I confirm present letter
for information, and
shall be glad to
receive a version
of the Code of Rule.

11/11/89

My view was advised
that the Agreement
does not fall under
article 173. In con-
sidering that it comes
under article 203 it
was subsequently bor-
ne in mind one special
condition, namely
that there was not
an interval of 6
months between
the 1st return from
the post-leave &
the date on which
he was granted the
second. I have
therefore written
their Agency with a
request that
he may be dealt
accordingly - wait
please till he
reply is received

12-11-89

(8)

Mr Cook's D.o of the
13th Instant in which
he has said that he would
withdraw his letter No. 238
of the 3rd. Idem re-Canal
leave to Mr Krishnaswamy
Ayer

13-11-95

Or 2 31 99

diary No. 1008
Ed 53

No 57

Bangalore 29th July 1899.

From
SECTION—Eden
The Principal
FILE No—97-99
Central College,
Bangalore
SERIAL No—1.

To

The Secretary to Government
General & Revenue Departments

Sir

I have the honor to report that Mr K A Krishnasami Iyer B A , High School Assistant of this College, was granted Leave from 5th to 19th July 1899 both days inclusive on account of his daughter's marriage which was celebrated at Kaveripatnam and that Mr V Vaidyanatha Iyer B A was appointed to act during the absence of Mr K A Krishnasami Iye

As Mr Krishnasami Iyer had already been granted Privilege Leave on half pay from the 2nd Nov 1898 to 24th Jan 1899 both days inclusive he is not in consequence entitled to any Privilege Leave now

I have the honor to recommend therefore that the Leave granted to Mr Krishnasami Iyer from 5th to 19th inst as Privilege Leave on half pay may be treated in accordance with Article 133 of Mysore Service Regulations and that this period may be deducted from the Privilege Leave on half pay that he may hereafter

CENTRAL COLLEGE BANGALORE

13 Nov 1899

My dear Mr Srinivasengar

You are entirely in the right, and I am very sorry I bothered you again with that letter No 238 dated 3rd inst. My visits should have called my attention to my first letter, which admitted that the Leave could not be granted under article 203, as you now very properly remind me.

It was this misleading head to article 173 that caused all the misunderstanding. I am exceedingly sorry and shall send an official withdrawal of my last-

letter a deal of trouble
has been wasted over the
business and I shall be
very particular as to any
leave in future



diary no 1008
Ga 53

No 57

Bangalore 29th July 1899.

From

SECTION- Eden

The Principal,
FILE No 9799 Central College,
Bangalore
SERIAL No 1.

To

The Secretary to Government
General & Revenue Departments

Sir

I have the honor to report that Mr K A Krishnasami Iyer B A , High School Assistant of this College. was granted Leave from 5th to 19th July 1899 both days inclusive on account of his daughter's marriage which was celebrated at Kaveripatnam and that Mr V Vaidyanatha Iyer B A. was appointed to act during the absence of Mr K A Krishnasami Iyer

As Mr, Krishnasami Iyer had already been granted Privilege Leave on half pay from the 2nd Nov 1898 to 24th Jan 1899 both days inclusive he is not in consequence entitled to any Privilege leave now

I have the honor to recommend therefore that the Leave granted to Mr Krishnasami Iyer from 5th to 19th inst as privilege leave on half pay may be treated in accordance with Article 133 of Mysore Service Regulations and that this period may be deducted from the Privilege Leave on half pay that he may hereafter

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant

Woolsey

Principal

SECTION Education (2) From No 1008 D 31/7/99
2953

FILE No 9 D 99 From the Pl Central College Bangalore

SERIAL No 2 To The Secretary to the Govt of Mysore General Department

No 570. 29th July 1899

Mr Cook's letter No 57 d 29th July recommending that the leave granted to Mr K A Krishnaswamy Iyer High School, assistant, Central College may be treated as leave under article 173 of the M.S. Reg

Memo No 1915 D 10/8/99
67

Forwarded to the Comptroller for favour of opinion.

(Sd) H Ramanujayya

9/8/99

may be treated as
leave without
allowances

(4)

Ed 98

OFFICE OF THE
2080
2-9-99189
DEWAN OF MYSORE

From The Secretary to the Govt of Mysore
Gen & Rev Depts

To The Controller

Dated 28th August 1899

Despatched

Received

General No 1177
No 363

Enclosure No

Yes - The Controller's
objection seems covered
by Rule 147 (2)
11-9-99

12145
I agree
BM
11 9 99

Proof
received
12-9-99
D. [illegible]

Stating that privilege leave
is not admissable to Officers
of the Educational & other Departts
under the ordinary rules and
that the 15 days' leave granted
to Mr Krishnasamy Iyer of the
Central College cannot be
deducted from a privilege
leave due to him

References to be marked

Submitted with
reference
HGS
5/9/99

Sub See
The 15 days' absence

From

The Comptroller, Mysore Govt

To

The Secretary to the Govt of Mysore

_____ Dept

Dated

Despatched

Received

L F No
No

SUBJECT MATTER

Treasur Account Department

~~I P~~ No 1177 OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER MYSORE GOVT

363 — Bangalore 23th August 18[illegible]

From

E R SUBRAYER, Esq, 2-9-99

Comptroller Mysore Govt

To

The Secretary to the Govt of Mysore,

General & Revenue Dept

Sir

With reference to your memo No 1315/Ed 67 dated 10th Instant forwarding for opinion letter No 97 dated 29th July 1899 from the Principal Central College Bangalore recommending that the 15 days leave granted to Mr Krishnaswami Iyer might be treated as Privilege leave or half pay in accordance with Article 173 of the Mysore service regulations and deducted from the privilege leave or half pay he might hereafter earn, I have the honour to state that privilege leave is not admissible to officers enjoying regular vacations as in the case of officers of other departments, but when urgent necessity arises privilege leave may be granted to these officers under the ordinary rules on certain conditions The rule is only permissive, and does not admit of any claim for leave as a right Under such circumstance the 15 days leave granted to Mr Krishnas wami Iyer can not be deducted from a privilege leave - not incurred and not likely to be incurred but likely to be permitted on special considerations and contingencies

Further article 173 of the Mysore service regulations is not applicable to Educational and such other officers for whom a separate provision is made in article 174 about the

grant

(a)

Grant of ordinar casual leave

The enclosure is herewith returned

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Comptroller

C A V

Subject

4 Read — Letter no 57 of 29th Ed. July 1899. from the Principal Central College, Bangalore,

FILE
SERAI

reporting that Mr H A Krishna Ayyar, High School Asstt was granted leave from the 5th to 19th July 1899 both days inclusive, and recommending that the leave granted to him may be treated as privilege leave on half pay in accordance with Art 173 of the MS. Regulations & deducted from the Privilege leave on half pay that he may hereafter earn

2 Comptroller's letter no 1177/363 of 28th Aug 99 on the same subject stating that art. 173 of the M.S. Regs is not applicable to Edl. Officers enjoying regular vacations

Order thereon no 3516-15 Edn

Dated 20-9-99

Under Art 203 (b) of the MS Regulations privilege leave is not admissible to Officers enjoying regular vacations

Under Secretary's order on the first page

"This order may be first passed, the Principal's and then framed, the Comptroller's letter being framed in Edn

Edl L A
19 9 99

Pension slip made
No 21/9/99

Vacations as in the case of
Officers of other Depts, except
in cases of urgent necessity
& on certain conditions

2 Art 173 of the 2nd Order
Regulations is not applicable
to Educational & such other
Officers for whom a separ-
ate provision is made in
art 174 about the grant of
Casual leave. ~~Leave~~ reported to have been
~~Leave~~ granted to W. Krishna
~~permissible under the Regulations~~ Sastry Govt. Coll. Cuddapah
~~should therefore~~ be treated
as leave without allowances,
as it exceeds the period of casual
leave permissible under Article 174 of the
Regns

Accepts

17-9-29

Secy

Ans
13/9/29

To The Principal, Central College
& Insp. General of Edn in Mysore
& Comptroller, Nungambakkam

READ—

Letter No 57, dated 29th July 1899 from the Principal Central College Bangalore

I have the honor to report that Mr K A Krishnasami Iyer B A, High School Assistant of this College was granted leave from 5th to 19th July 1899 both days inclusive, on account of his daughter's marriage which was celebrated at Kaveripatnam and that Mr V Vaidyanatha Iyer B A, was appointed to act during the absence of Mr K A Krishnasami Iyer

As Mr Krishnasami Iyer had already been granted privilege leave on half pay from the 2nd November 1898 to 24th January 1899 both days inclusive he is not in consequence entitled to any privilege leave now

I have the honor to recommend therefore that the leave granted to Mr Krishnasami Iyer from 5th to 19th instant may be treated as privilege leave on half pay in accordance with Article 173 of the Mysore Service Regulations and that this period may be deducted from the privilege leave on half pay that he may hereafter earn

2 *Letter No 1177—363 dated 28th August 1899 from the Comptroller to the Government of Mysore Bangalore*

With reference to your Memo No 1915—Ed 67, dated 10th instant forwarding for opinion, letter No 57 dated 29th July 1899 from the Principal Central College Bangalore recommending that the 15 days leave granted to Mr Krishnasami Iyer might be treated as privilege leave on half pay in accordance with Article 173 of the Mysore Service Regulations and deducted from the privilege leave on half pay he might hereafter earn, I have the honor to state that privilege leave is not admissible to officers enjoying regular vacations as in the case of officers of other Departments but when urgent necessity arises privilege leave may be granted to these officers under the ordinary rule on certain conditions The rule is only permissive and does not admit of any claim for leave as a right Under such circumstance the 15 days leave granted to Mr Krishnasami Iyer cannot be deducted from a privilege leave not *earned* and not likely to be *earned* but likely to be permitted on special considerations and contingencies

Further Article 173 of the Mysore Service Regulations is not applicable to Educational and such other officers for whom a separate provision is made in Article 174 about the grant of ordinary casual leave

The enclosure is herewith returned.

No 3816 18—Ed 140 DATED BANGALORE, 20TH SEPTEMBER 1899

ORDER THEREON —The Government accept the view expressed by the Comptroller, and the leave reported to have been granted to Mr Krishnasami Iyer will accordingly be treated as leave without allowances, as it exceeds the period of casual leave permissible under Article 174 of the Mysore Service Regulations

C SRILLNIVASILNGAR
Secy to Govt, Gen & Rev Depts

To—The Principal Central College Bangalore
The Inspector General of Education in Mysore
The Comptroller to the Government of Mysore Bangalore

Exd —K.A.R.

1899-1900

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

EDUCATION

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 20th September 1899

No $\frac{3816\ 18}{\text{Ed } 140}$

Directing that, for reasons stated, the leave granted to Mr K A Krishnasami Iyer, B A, High School Assistant, Central College, be treated as leave without allowances

SPP—29 9 99—200

Ed 149

189

OFFICE OF THE
2953
27-9-99
DEWAN OF MYSORE

From

The Principal
Central College
Bangalore

FILE No 96-99
CLASS No 5 To

THE SECY TO THE GOVT OF MYSORE,
GEN & REV DEPTS

Dated 25th Sept 1899

Despatched

Received

General No 166
No

Enclosure No

Pointing out that Vacational Officers enjoying Annual Vacations are not entitled to Privilege Leave on full pay but that they may be granted Privilege Leave on half pay as was granted at the end of last year, &c &c

---

References to be marked

No 166 (10) Bangalore 25th Sept 189

From

The Principal,
Central College,
Bangalore

To

The Secretary to Government
General & Revenue Departments

Sir,

With reference to Government Order No 3816-18 Ed 140 dated 20th Sept 1899, re my letter No 57 dated 29th July 1899, recommending that the leave granted to Mr Krishnaswami Iyer may be treated as Privilege Leave on half pay in accordance with Article 173 of the Mysore Service Regulations and Comptroller's letter No 1177/363 dated 28th August 1899 (of which no copy was forwarded) stating that Article 173 of the Mysore Service Regulations is not applicable to Educational Officers enjoying regular vacations, I have the honor to point out that Educational Officers enjoying Annual Vacations are not entitled to Privilege Leave on full pay but that by Article 203 (b) they may be granted Privilege Leave on half pay and as a matter of fact this was already granted at the end of last year in accordance with this Article to several of the Assistants of this College by Government Orders Nos 10046-7 Ed 219, 10060-2 Ed 220, 10636-7 Ed 232, dated 27th Feb, 27th Feb, 14th March 1899 respectively

As Article 173 is distinctly headed to Officers not entitled to Privilege Leave it must therefore be applicable to Educational Officers No Privilege Leave on half pay was due to Mr Krishnaswamy Iyer, he having enjoyed such from 2nd November 1898 to 25th January 1899, in accordance with Government Order No 10046-7 Ed 219 dated 27th Feb 1899

(11)

My proposal is merely the application of Article 173 that the Casual Leave of 15days 5th to 19th July 1899, granted to him, may be deducted from the Privilege Leave - on half pay - that may hereafter be earned by this Officer The contention of the Comptroller I fail to understand, as it directly contradicts the heading of Article 173 referred to

Here is no mention of anywhere words meaning the Grant of Concession

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Principal

(12)

Ed 174

Principal
Central College

3437
10-10-99
189
OF MYSORE

Reader
FILE No 90-99
No 6
To

THE SECY TO THE GOVT OF MYSORE
GEN & REV DEPTS

Dated 7-10-99
Despatched
Received
General No 191
No
Enclosure No

Acknowledging receipt of number of printed copies re G O No 3816-18 Ed 140 dated 30th Sept with Complete letter No 1177-363 dated 28th August 1899

References to be marked

Submitted with the
Recent communication from
Mysore re the subject

16/10/99

(13)

No 191

Central College, Bangalore.

7th October 1899

From

The Principal,

Central College, Bangalore

To

The Secretary to Govt. of Mysore,

Genl & Rev Departments

Sir,

In continuation of my letter No 166 dated 25th September 1899, re the Government Order No 3816-18 Ed 140 dated 20th September 1899, I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of a number of printed copies of the same containing the Comptroller's letter No 1177-363 dated 28th August 1899, which I had not before me, when I wrote to the Government, I now perceive that the whole contention of the Comptroller is based on a strained use of the word earn, but I have the honor to point out that Article 173 is distinctly headed "No Officers not entitled to Privilege Leave" and the word earn is taken from that Article and I am utterly unable, with the Comptroller's letter before me, to understand the ground of his contention, or to see other than a confusion of thought between the heading and the body of Article 173

In these circumstances I have the honor to request to be informed how these are to be reconciled

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

Principal

Sub Secretary Read (14)
to Govt. Order No. EDK 25 Edn dated 25th Sept 58 from
the Principal, Govt. Basic
College, Bangalore
stating, in connection
with the leave granted
to Sri. Krishnamurthy
Sr. High School
Asst that Educa-
tional Officers en-
joying annual
vacations are not
entitled to Privilege
leave on full pay,
but that by Govt. Order 203
(b) they may be granted
Privilege leave on
half pay and that
as Govt Order 173 is distinctly

leaded to waivers
not entitled to Priv.
leave known & must
therefore be applicable
to Educational Offrs

2 dated 20. 1918 y/fr.
Oct. 5th from the same
officer applying for
further instructions
on the same subject.
as he says a diffi-
culty in reconciling
the wording with the
body of Art 173 of the
Supra Ser Regns.

Order No 5232-5-D. 31/10/18
Ed 185

Privilege leave
granted to Ed
catenal & Sther

officers enjoying
annual (15) vacations
(under art. 203) is
not Privilege bears
at their credit
in the sense in
which the word
is used in art. 172
"s.f." Privilege bears
but which hereafter
become as contem-
plated by art. 173.
Neither of these
articles therefore
applies & there is
hardly person
has ever been
made for such
officers under art
174. and Privilege

leave under Art
203. [illegible] &
leave only in cases
of urgent necessity
In the case of other
officers entitled to
privilege leave it is
earned by service as
a matter of course,
and urgent necessity
is not a sine qua non
The same distinction
is apparent from the heading
of Art: 173 which refers
to the latter class of
officers who have no
"earned" privilege
leave, & therefore not
entitled to commuted rest
Art 174 which applies

& officers enjoying
annual vacation
& who for that reason
are entitled to no
privilege leave

2. As exemplified in
the foregoing remark
the heading is quite
reconcilable with the
body of Art 173
of the Govt see no
reason to reconsider
the orders already
passed in the case
of Mr. Kusumasamy
Iyer

Printed copies
are not available
Sd

To The Principal Central
College Bangalore
Insp-Genl of Edn
Registrar Chief Office Treasuries
Public Works Account

Sd
29-10-29
Sec

Typed
Press Copy made
1/11-10-29

Ed. 198 (14)
189

4205
7-11 29

From

The Principal
Central College

To

THE SECY TO THE GOVT OF MYSORE,
GEN & REV DEPTS

Dated 3rd Nov 1879

Despatched

Received

General No 238
No

Enclosure No

Regarding the reverse Govt order no 3876-18 Ed 140 of 20-9-1879 in the light of the explanations submitted

---

References to be marked

no 238

(20)

Central College, Bangalore.
3rd November 1899

From

The Principal, Central College, Bangalore.

To

The Secretary to Govt. of Mysore, Genl. & Rev. Depts.

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of Government Order No. 5232-5 Ed.165 dated 30th October 1899 re my Nos 57, 166, 191 dated 29th July, 25th Sept., 7th October 1899 respectively, giving an explanation and reconciliation of the heading of article 173 and the body of the same article and stating that Government see no reason to reconsider the orders already passed, but as the principle involved in that case is too important to be decided upon a mere contention of the Comptroller as to the meaning of article 173, I have the honor to say that I now find that in the article in the Government of India Civil Service Regulations, of which article 173 is manifestly a copy, there is no such confusing heading as in the Mysore Civil Service Regulations. With this heading omitted, as it ought to be, in the Mysore Service Regulations, I should never have based my request for sanction of Privilege Leave on half pay to Mr. Krishnasami Iyer on that article, but on article 203 which distinctly says " incase of urgent necessity Privilege Leave may be granted to any such officer (i.e. Educational officers and others, who have regular vacations,) subject" to conditions which have been obeyed in this case. The only possible ground on which sanction may be refused to the leave which was granted by me on the special ground of its being an urgent matter - a marriage of Mr. Krishnasami Iyer's daughter at Kaveripatnam - is either that the urgency of such a matter is not sufficiantto grant leave under article 203, which ground as far as I understand, could not possibly be taken, or that I should not have granted leave without first obtaining the sanction of Government. But Mr. Krishnasami Iyer informs me that the circumstances of the case were peculiar so that he could not inform me till within a few days of the marriage, and therefore I was constrained to allow him to go and accept an acting man in his place.

I have the honor therefore, as the principle is a more important one for Educational officers, to request that the Government may have the goodness to revise their order No. 3816-18 ed,140 dated 20th . Sept 1899

(PTO)

in the light of the explanations now submitted by me

I have the honour to be
Sir,

Your most obedient servant

Principal.

(21-) Ed: 205

OFFICE OF THE 4415 189. Dy 13-11-99

From Inam Officiating

File No 12 07 99

To

Serial No 9 The Secy. to the Govt of Mysore, Gen & Rev Depts

Central College, Bangalore

Dated 13th Nov 1899

Despatched

Received

General No 252

No

Enclosure No 1

Withdrawing his last letter and acknowledging the correctness of the Comptroller's statement that Mr K Krishnaswamy Iyer was not entitled to Leave without allowances.

References to be marked

This The reply from Mr. Cook does hereunto submitted

Tele
13-11-99

Sub Secy

Mr. Cook's previous letter may be filed

Dy 15-11-99

No 252
Enc one

D' 15/11/99

Central College, Bangalore
13th November 1899

From
The Principal,
Central College, Bangalore

To
The Secretary to Govt of Mysore,
General & Revenue Depts.

Sir,

With reference to my letter No 238 dated 3rd November 1899 I am in receipt of your D O dated 12th November 1899 and find from it that I had acknowledged in my first letter dated 29th July 1899, that Mr Krishnasami Iyer could not get Privilege Leave under Article 203, as he had not completed six months' time since returning from Privilege Leave on 24th. January 1899.

In these circumstances I beg to withdraw my last letter and to acknowledge the correctness of the Comptroller's statement that he was not entitled to leave wothout allowances

The ambiguous and misleading heading of Article 173, which is in the Mysore Leave Rules, but not in those of the Government of India, has been the cause of all the trouble which, I am sorry, I have given you in connexion with this matter

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant

Principal

D I .